



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/262,743	03/05/1999	MARI NATORI	02887.0136	9908

7590 01/25/2002
FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW & DUNNER LLP
1300 I STREET N W
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

KENDALL, CHUCK O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H.G

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/262,743

Applicant(s)

NATORI ET AL.

Examiner

Chuck O Kendall

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Examiners Response

1. This Office Action is the response to the communication received on *December 21, 2001* Amendment under 37 CFR § 1.111. Reconsideration of the instant application is requested by applicants. All such supporting documentation has been placed of record in the file. Claims 1-14 are pending in this application.

2. *Response to Arguments*

Regarding rejection of the claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a):
Examiner has evaluated applicant's arguments and Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The San Francisco Project in view of Lau USPN 5,987,247.

With regards to claim 1 The San Francisco project discloses constructing a business application using a framework . (The San Francisco Project, 1st paragraph, pg 416) comprising an abstract class including core class group, (*Base class / Parent class*, page 420 1st paragraph) a report

Art Unit: 2122

system class group (see figure on pg. 418, for financials also see 2nd col. 3rd paragraph for Business financials/accounts/ledger for equivalence function with reports, a business logic system class group, (see figure on pg. 418, for logistics in model), integrating above mentioned limitations, see 419, last paragraph, and with regards to derived classes as disclosed above inheriting from base class, is an old and Well known feature in Object Oriented Frameworks.

The San Francisco Project doesn't explicitly disclose a screen system group, although it does suggest a motivation to combine such feature mentioning application updates to include this feature, see pg 416, 2nd paragraph. However, Lau does disclose a screen system in a Business Framework [see fig 2. item #209]. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify The primary reference with Lau limitation to implement applicants invention because, screens improve ease of use in constructing and using Object Oriented Architectures.

With regards to claim 2 (amended) as applied in claim 1 constructing a business application system as set comprising a plurality of common components commonly for use in said business application system (see 420, 1st paragraph) for interface between components an abstract class, see 419 1st and 2nd paragraph, for interoperability between objects and applications.

With regards to claim 3 (amended) refer to reasoning in Claim 1.

With regards to claim 4 (amended) refer to reasoning in Claim 1.

With regards to claim 5, The San Francisco project as modified discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claim 1. The San Francisco Project doesn't explicitly disclose compiling and linking system classes to be integrated. Lau does disclose compiling to integrated models. [9:53-54] Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify The Sanfrancisco Project by compiling as taught by Lau because, compiling and linking makes integrated programs run more efficiently.

Art Unit: 2122

With regards to claim 6 see reasoning in claims 1 for interfacing and integrating said system classes.

With regards to claim 7 (amended) refer to reasoning in Claim 1.

With regards to claim 8 (amended) refer to reasoning in Claim 2.

With regards to Claim 9 refer to claim 1 for reasoning.

With regards to claim 10 Abstract classes included in each of said system core class group, (see 418, 2nd col. 2nd paragraph for extending functionality in core class, said abstract class group includes an abstract method and a concrete method. (Prior art uses Java as Language in Framework and therefore it would be obvious to have abstract and concrete methods to extend user customizable functionality, which is also old and well known in Frameworks).

With regards to claim 11 (amended) a system core class group having defined manipulation of data, (see 422 last paragraph, see transactions, Orbs, legacy Data map, Object Query)

And for screen system, report system, and business logic system class see reasoning in claim 1.

With regards to claim 12 (amended) as set forth in claim 11 refer to reasoning in Claim 2.

As applied in claim 1, with regards to claim 13 a Framework, see reasoning in claim 1, transmitting and receiving request between functions from class groups, (422, col. 2 see ORBs, Object Request Broker, and transactions for Distributed Objects)

A screen system class, a report system, and a business logic system class inheriting said system core class group, refer to claim 1 for reasoning.

With regards to claim 14 (amended) as set forth in claim 13 refer to reasoning in Claim 2.

Art Unit: 2122

3. *This action is made Final.*

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive to overcome rejection

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action. see MPEP § 706.07 (a).

Correspondence Information

Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuck O. Kendall who may be reached via telephone at (703) 308-6608. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. est.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Greg Morse* can be reached at (703) 308-4789.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

For facsimile (fax) send to 703-7467239 official and 703-7467240 draft

Chuck O. Kendall

Software Engineer Patent Examiner
United States Department of Commerce


GREGORY A. MORSE
PRIMARY EXAMINER